



JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

THE CHIEF JUSTICE
OF THE UNITED STATES
Presiding

LEONIDAS RALPH MECHAM
Secretary

March 31, 2003

Honorable C.W. Bill Young
Chairman
Committee on Appropriations
United States House of Representatives
H-218 Capitol Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Pursuant to my authority to provide accommodations for the federal courts under 28 U.S.C. §§604(a)(12) and 462(b), and as authorized by the Judicial Conference of the United States, I am pleased to transmit to you the judiciary's courthouse construction requirements for fiscal year 2004 along with the out-year requirements for fiscal years 2005-2008. I will be transmitting to your staff a budget request for the construction of federal courthouses in fiscal year 2004 along with detailed project justification documents. For the fourth time since 1998, courthouses have been totally excluded from the President's budget submission even though the General Services Administration (GSA) submitted the judiciary's fiscal year 2004 courthouse construction needs to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in September 2002. The judiciary has determined it necessary to submit a courthouse construction budget request directly to Congress and asks that GSA receive any fiscal year 2004 appropriations approved for courthouses.

The courthouse construction projects requested for fiscal year 2004 follow the judiciary's prioritization process, which was developed at the request of Congress. This process first utilizes a long-range planning methodology. All requests are then scored based on security and operational problems at existing court facilities as well as the length of time a building has been filled to capacity and the number of judges needing space. These housing requirements have been reviewed and approved by the circuit judicial councils, which have the statutory authority and responsibility to determine the

Honorable C.W. Bill Young
Page Two

need for court space. The 20 projects currently ready for funding in fiscal year 2004 are located (in order of priority) in: Los Angeles, CA; Richmond, VA; San Antonio, TX; Anniston, AL; Harrisburg, PA; Greenville, SC; Toledo, OH; Charlotte, NC; Orlando, FL; Savannah, GA; San Jose, CA; El Paso, TX; Mobile, AL; Las Cruces, NM; Salt Lake City, UT; Rockford, IL; Fort Lauderdale, FL; Greensboro, NC; Benton, IL; and Sioux Falls, SD.

The judiciary has attempted to limit its request to \$500 million per year. This amount is based on previous discussions with Congressional, OMB and GSA officials and is used for planning purposes. However, because funds were not requested by the President in 1998, 1999, and 2000, a backlog of projects now exists. The judiciary's fiscal year 2004 budget request is \$967.3 million because it includes unfunded projects from previous years. The fiscal year 2004 columns of the enclosed Five-Year Courthouse Project Plan give priority to: (1) those projects ready for contract award in an earlier fiscal year, but which have not been funded (the left-hand column of the fiscal year 2004 plan); and (2) other projects which the judiciary and GSA agree are ready for funding in fiscal year 2004. An additional six projects for fiscal year 2004 are shown on the Five-Year Courthouse Project Plan because they were submitted to OMB by GSA for funding consideration; however, they are not now ready for contract award.

Funding for these courthouse projects in fiscal year 2004 will permit the judiciary to meet the challenges of increased law enforcement activity across the country and to provide secure and efficient courthouse facilities to the residents of the districts where the projects are planned. The judiciary certainly understands the budgetary constraints under which you operate and appreciates your attention to our needs. We hope Congress will provide GSA with the necessary authorizations and appropriations to meet these requirements.

If we can provide further information, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ralph", with a stylized, flowing script.

Leonidas Ralph Mecham
Secretary

Enclosure

(estimated dollars in millions)
Fiscal Year 2004

FY 2004 Requirements		Ready	Not Ready	Score
1	Buffalo, NY	C	\$87.5	68.3
2	Fort Pierce, FL	C	\$29.4	65.7
3	Jackson, MS	C	\$87.3	64.8
4	El Paso, TX	Add'l. S&D / C	\$55.9	61.9
5	Mobile, AL	Add'l. D/C	\$85.8	61.3
6	Norfolk, VA	C	\$75.7	58.9
7	Las Cruces, NM	S / Add'l. D / C	\$52.9	56.3
8	Salt Lake City, UT	Add'l. S	\$3.7	\$90.8 / C
9	Rockford, IL	Add'l. S&D / C	\$48.8	54.3
10	Fort Lauderdale, FL	S&D	\$19.4	53.8
11	Greensboro, NC	S&D	\$14.2	53.7
12	Benton, IL	S&D	\$6.3	53.3
13	Cedar Rapids, IA	C	\$67.4	52.9
14	Nashville, TN	C	\$86.0	51.8
15	Sioux Falls, SD	S&D	\$20.9	50.0
		\$307.9		

Five-Year Courthouse Project Plan FY 2004-2008

(estimated dollars in millions)

FY 2005				Score
1	Baltimore, MD	S&D	\$30.1	74.7
2	Chattanooga, TN	S&D	\$10.5	73.9
3	Macon, GA	S&D	\$9.6	73.3
4	Lexington, KY	S&D	\$8.6	68.5
5	Wilmington, DE	S&D	\$7.0	68.2
6	Rochester, NY	S&D	\$1.3	67.8
7	Grand Rapids, MI	S&D	\$5.5	65.1
8	Austin, TX	C	\$44.0	61.5
9	San Antonio, TX	C	\$156.4	61.3
10	San Diego, CA (USDC)	C	\$184.7	58.4
			\$457.7	

FY 2006				Score
1	Alexandria, LA	S&D	\$3.4	64.3
2	Tulsa, OK	S&D	\$2.8	62.6
3	Durham, NC	S&D	\$3.2	62.1
4	Clarksburg, WV	S&D	\$3.6	61.9
5	Dallas, TX	S&D	\$19.9	60.1
6	Pikeville, KY	S&D	\$1.1	59.1
7	Anniston, AL	C	\$13.8	58.6
8	Des Moines, IA	S&D	\$8.6	58.5
9	Harrisburg, PA	C	\$42.7	58.3
10	Huntsville, AL	S&D	\$1.5	58.0
11	Greenbelt, MD	S&D	\$8.0	57.7
12	Syracuse, NY	S&D	\$5.0	57.7
13	Green Bay, WI	S&D	\$2.0	57.2
14	Greenville, SC	C	\$42.5	56.6
15	Toledo, OH	C	\$46.0	54.4
16	Charlotte, NC	C	\$63.3	54.0
17	Fort Lauderdale, FL	C	\$108.0	53.8
18	Greensboro, NC	C	\$54.6	53.7
19	Benton, IL	C	\$18.2	53.3
20	Sioux Falls, SD	C	\$40.0	50.0
21	San Jose, CA	C	\$147.0	39.5
			\$635.2	

S = Site; D = Design; C = Construction.

Five-Year Courthouse Project Plan FY 2004-2008

(estimated dollars in millions)

FY 2007				Score
1	Baltimore, MD	C	\$142.9	74.7
2	Chattanooga, TN	C	\$47.0	73.9
3	Macon, GA	C	\$39.2	73.3
4	Lexington, KY	C	\$48.8	68.5
5	Wilmington, DE	C	\$39.5	68.2
6	Rochester, NY	C	\$11.9	67.8
7	Grand Rapids, MI	C	\$31.2	65.1
8	Birmingham, AL	S&D	\$6.5	57.0
9	Panama City, FL	S&D	\$3.9	56.5
10	West Palm Beach, FL	S&D	\$7.4	55.8
11	Philadelphia, PA (COA)	S&D	\$5.9	54.5
12	Columbus, OH	S&D	\$13.0	53.8
13	Burlington, VT	S&D	\$5.6	52.5
14	Aberdeen, MS	S&D	\$3.7	48.5
15	Jefferson City, MO	S&D	\$2.2	48.5
			\$408.7	

FY 2008				Score
1	Alexandria, LA	C	\$14.0	64.3
2	Tulsa, OK	C	\$18.2	62.6
3	Durham, NC	C	\$12.9	62.1
4	Clarksburg, WV	C	\$23.5	61.9
5	Dallas, TX	C	\$129.4	60.1
6	Pikeville, KY	C	\$7.3	59.1
7	Des Moines, IA	C	\$56.1	58.5
8	Huntsville, AL	C	\$5.9	58.0
9	Greenbelt, MD	C	\$52.0	57.7
10	Syracuse, NY	C	\$48.2	57.7
11	Green Bay, WI	C	\$11.4	57.2
12	Houston, TX	S&D	\$23.9	48.0
13	Marquette, MI	S&D	\$1.3	46.9
14	Flint, MI	S&D	\$5.1	46.8
15	Bowling Green, KY	S&D	\$2.3	43.2
16	Peoria, IL	S&D	\$7.6	41.2
			\$419.1	

S = Site; D = Design; C = Construction